

Shift Operators Contained in Contractions, Pseudocontinuable Schur Functions and Orthogonal Systems on the Unit Circle

Vladimir K. Dubovoy, Bernd Fritzsche, Bernd Kirstein
and Andreas Lasarow

Dedicated to D.Z. Arov on the occasion of his 75th birthday

Abstract. The main aim of this paper is to establish the connection between well-known criteria for the pseudocontinuity of a non-inner Schur function Θ in the unit disk (see Theorems 3.9 and 4.2). In a canonical way we associate a probability measure μ on the unit circle with Θ . One of the two criteria will be reformulated in the face of μ , whereas the other one is drafted in view of a completely non-unitary contraction T having Θ as its corresponding characteristic function. Our main result clarifies an immediate connection between the above-mentioned two criteria. For this reason, we construct a special orthogonal basis in the space L^2_μ and rewrite these criteria in terms of this orthogonal basis. (see Theorem 7.2).

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000). Primary 30E05, 47A57.

Keywords. Pseudocontinuity, Schur functions, associated probability measure on the unit circle, Szegő function, orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle, shift operators contained in contractions.

0. Introduction

The central topic of this paper is the discussion of pseudocontinuity for Schur functions in the unit disk. Pseudocontinuity is a particular type of meromorphic continuation for functions from the meromorphic Nevanlinna class in the unit disk. This concept originated in Shapiro's papers [17], [18] and was then systematically discussed a little bit later in the context of invariant subspaces for the backward shift in the landmark paper Douglas/Shapiro/Shields [6]. (Regarding modern

The work of the fourth author of the present paper was supported by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) on badge LA 1386/2-1.

treatments of this area we refer the reader to the monographs Cima/Ross [5] and Ross/Shapiro [16].)

Important applications of pseudocontinuity are contained in the work of D.Z. Arov on Darlington synthesis, J -inner functions, and related topics (see, e.g., [1] and [2]).

A further domain of application of pseudocontinuable functions is rational approximation. This theme which originated from a series of papers by G.Ts. Tumarkin (see [20], [21], and [22]) was treated by Katsnelson in [12]. The paper [12] is recommended for some other reasons too. It contains an extensive historical overview on the investigation of pseudocontinuable functions which also takes into account matrix-valued functions. Moreover, the paper [12] is very well written from the pedagogical point of view. It strongly influenced our approach to introducing pseudocontinuable functions (see Section 2).

The present paper continues recent investigations on several questions of pseudocontinuity of Schur functions in the unit disk (see [3] and [7]). Our main aim is to establish a direct relation between two well-known criteria for pseudocontinuity of non-inner Schur functions in the unit disk (see Theorem 3.9 and Theorem 4.2). The main result of this paper is a new characterization of pseudocontinuity of a non-inner Schur function Θ in the unit disk. This characterization is expressed in terms of a special orthogonal basis in an L^2_μ space on the unit circle, where μ is some probability measure on the unit circle which is canonically associated with Θ (see Theorem 7.2).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 1, we recall that the set of Schur functions in the unit disk stands in bijective correspondences to the set of normalized Carathéodory functions in the unit disk and to the set of probability measures on the Borel σ -algebra of the unit circle. This will give us the possibility to study the pseudocontinuity of a given Schur function in terms of the associated normalized Carathéodory function and in terms of the associated probability measure, respectively.

In Section 2 (influenced by Katsnelson [12]), we summarize essential facts on meromorphic functions and the concept of pseudocontinuity which is due to H.S. Shapiro.

Section 3 contains a function-theoretic approach to the study of pseudocontinuity of non-inner Schur functions in the unit disk. We will recognize that a function of this class admits a pseudocontinuation if and only if the associated probability measure satisfies the Szegő condition and the corresponding Szegő function is pseudocontinuable (see Theorem 3.9).

The central theme of Section 4 is an operator-theoretic approach to the investigation of pseudocontinuity of non-inner Schur functions in the unit disk. The starting point there is the observation that an arbitrary Schur function can be represented as a characteristic function of some completely non-unitary contraction in a separable complex Hilbert space. Then the pseudocontinuity of a non-inner Schur function Θ can be characterized in terms of the contraction T having Θ as its characteristic function. More precisely, the maximal unilateral shifts

V_T and V_{T^*} contained in T and T^* , respectively, have to fulfill certain conditions of mutual interrelations (see Theorem 4.2).

In Section 5, we start from a probability measure μ on the Borel σ -algebra of the unit circle. The main aim is to construct a unitary colligation Δ_μ , the characteristic function Θ_{Δ_μ} of which coincides with the Schur function Θ_μ associated with the measure μ according to Section 1.

In Section 6, we consider a probability measure μ on the Borel σ -algebra of the unit circle for which the polynomials are non-complete in the space L_μ^2 . In this case the question arises as to the existence of a natural completion of the system of orthonormal polynomials in L_μ^2 to a complete orthonormal system in L_μ^2 . The primary concern of Section 6 is to construct such a natural completion. In the particular case that the measure μ is associated with a pseudocontinuable non-inner Schur function Θ , we will show that the functions obtained by completing the orthonormal system of polynomials are boundary values of functions belonging to the meromorphic Nevanlinna class in the unit disk (see Proposition 6.15).

The goal of Section 7 is to reformulate the characterization of the pseudocontinuity of a non-inner Schur function given by Theorem 4.2 in terms of the complete orthonormal system which was created in Section 6 (see Theorem 7.2).

Finally, Section 8 is aimed at determining and further clarifying a direct connection between the criteria of pseudocontinuity of a non-inner Schur function which were pointed out in Theorem 3.9 and Theorem 4.2, respectively.

1. Interrelated triples consisting of a Schur function, a normalized Carathéodory function and a probability measure

Let $\mathbb{D} := \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} : |\zeta| < 1\}$ and $\mathbb{T} := \{t \in \mathbb{C} : |t| = 1\}$ be the unit disk and the unit circle in the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$, respectively. The central object in this paper is the Schur class $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ of all functions $\Theta : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which are holomorphic in $\mathbb{D}$ and satisfy $\Theta(\mathbb{D}) \subseteq \mathbb{D} \cup \mathbb{T}$. Our main aim is to study the phenomenon of pseudocontinuity for functions belonging to $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$. In order to allow for a more effective treatment of this question, we first consider certain important objects that relate bijectively to the class $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$. This is the main content of the present section.

Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$. Then the function $\Phi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$\Phi(\zeta) := \frac{1 + \zeta\Theta(\zeta)}{1 - \zeta\Theta(\zeta)} \quad (1.1)$$

is holomorphic in $\mathbb{D}$ and satisfies

$$\operatorname{Re} [\Phi(\zeta)] > 0, \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{D}, \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$\Phi(0) = 1. \quad (1.3)$$

Let $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{D})$ be the Carathéodory class of all functions $\Psi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which are holomorphic in $\mathbb{D}$ and satisfy $\operatorname{Re}[\Psi(\zeta)] \geq 0$ and let

$$\mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{D}) := \{\Psi \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{D}) : \Psi(0) = 1\}. \quad (1.4)$$

In view of (1.1), (1.2), (1.3), and (1.4) we have

$$\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{D}). \quad (1.5)$$

It can be easily verified that via (1.1) a bijective correspondence between the classes $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ and $\mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{D})$ is established. Note that from (1.1) it follows that

$$\zeta \Theta(\zeta) = \frac{\Phi(\zeta) - 1}{\Phi(\zeta) + 1}, \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (1.6)$$

The class $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{D})$ is intimately related with the class $\mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$ of all finite nonnegative measures on the Borel σ -algebra $\mathfrak{B}$ of $\mathbb{T}$. According to the Riesz-Herglotz Theorem (see, e.g., [8, Theorem 2.2.2]): For each function $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{D})$ there exists a unique measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$ and a unique number $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\Phi(\zeta) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{t + \zeta}{t - \zeta} \mu(dt) + i\beta, \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (1.7)$$

Obviously, $\beta = \operatorname{Im}[\Phi(0)]$. On the other hand, it can be easily checked that, for arbitrary $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, the function Φ , which is defined by the right hand side of (1.7), belongs to $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{D})$. If we consider the Riesz-Herglotz representation (1.7) for a function $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{D})$, then $\beta = 0$ and μ belongs to the set $\mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$ of all probability measures belonging to $\mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$ (i.e. $\mu(\mathbb{T}) = 1$). Actually, in this way we obtain a bijective correspondence between the classes $\mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{D})$ and $\mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$.

In the result of the above considerations we obtain special ordered triples $[\Theta, \Phi, \mu]$ consisting of a function $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$, a function $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{D})$, and a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$ which are interrelated in such way that each of these three objects uniquely determines the other two. For that reason, if one of the three objects is given, we will say that the two others are associated with it. Based on this procedure, in Section 3 we will characterize the pseudocontinuity of a function $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ in terms of the associated objects $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{D})$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$.

2. Some basic facts on classes of meromorphic functions and pseudocontinuity

In this section, we summarize some facts on several classes of meromorphic functions which will be used later. (A detailed treatment of this subject can be found, e.g., in Duren [9] and Nevanlinna [13].) In particular, we will recall the concept of pseudocontinuation.

We will use $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\mathbb{E}$ to denote the extended complex plane and the exterior of the closed unit disk, respectively, i.e. $\overline{\mathbb{C}} := \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $\mathbb{E} := \overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus (\mathbb{D} \cup \mathbb{T})$. Furthermore, the symbol m stands for the normalized linear Lebesgue-Borel measure on $\mathbb{T}$. So we have $m(\mathbb{T}) = 1$, i.e. $m \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$.

Assume that G is one of the domains $\mathbb{D}$ or $\mathbb{E}$. Let $\mathcal{NM}(G)$ be the Nevanlinna class of all functions which are meromorphic in G and which can be represented as a quotient of two bounded holomorphic functions in G . If $h \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ (resp. $h \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{E})$), then a well-known theorem due to Fatou implies that there is a set $B_0 \in \mathfrak{B}$ with $m(B_0) = 0$ and a Borel measurable function $\underline{h} : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1-0} h(rt) = \underline{h}(t) \quad \left(\text{resp. } \lim_{r \rightarrow 1+0} h(rt) = \underline{h}(t) \right)$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus B_0$. In the following, we will continue to use the symbol $\underline{h}$ to denote such a boundary function of a function h which belongs to $\mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ or $\mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{E})$.

There is a standard bijective correspondence between the sets $\mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ and $\mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{E})$. In order to describe this we introduce some further notation. Let G be a nonempty subset of $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$. Then $G^\wedge$ denotes that subset of $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ which is symmetric to G with respect to the unit circle, i.e.

$$G^\wedge := \left\{ z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}} : \frac{1}{z^*} \in G \right\}$$

with the usual conventions $\frac{1}{0^*} := \infty$ and $\frac{1}{\infty^*} := 0$. Here z^* means the complex conjugate of z . If $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, then $f^\wedge$ stands for the complex-valued function which is defined on $G^\wedge$ by

$$f^\wedge(z) := \left(f\left(\frac{1}{z^*}\right) \right)^*.$$

Now the bijective correspondence between the sets $\mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ and $\mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{E})$ can be expressed as follows.

Remark 2.1. If $h \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ (resp. $h \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{E})$), then the function $h^\wedge$ belongs to $\mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{E})$ (resp. to $\mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$) and $\underline{h}^*$ is the boundary function of $h^\wedge$.

Remark 2.2. Let $G \in \{\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{T}\}$ and let $h \in \mathcal{NM}(G)$ not vanish identically in G . Then the function $\ln|\underline{h}|$ is m -integrable and $m(\{\underline{h} = 0\}) = 0$.

The set $\mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ (resp. $\mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{E})$) is obviously an algebra over $\mathbb{C}$. The subalgebra of all $h \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ which are holomorphic in $\mathbb{D}$ will be designated by $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$. The class $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$ can be characterized as the set of all functions h which are holomorphic in $\mathbb{D}$ and which satisfy

$$\sup_{r \in [0,1)} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln^+ |h(rt)| m(dt) < +\infty,$$

where $\ln^+ x := \max\{\ln x, 0\}$ for each $x \in [0, +\infty)$. If a function $D : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ admits a representation

$$D(\zeta) = \alpha \cdot \exp \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{t+\zeta}{t-\zeta} \ln[k(t)] m(dt) \right\}, \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{D},$$

with some $\alpha \in \mathbb{T}$ and some Borel measurable function $k : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ satisfying

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} |\ln[k(t)]| m(dt) < +\infty,$$

then D belongs to $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$ and $|\underline{D}| = k$ holds m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Such functions D are called outer functions in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$.

Remark 2.3. Let D be an outer function in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$. Then $D(\zeta) \neq 0$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$ and the function D^{-1} is an outer function in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$ as well. Moreover, if D_1 and D_2 are outer functions in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$, then $D_1 D_2$ is an outer function in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$.

An outer function D in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$ is called normalized if $D(0) \in (0, +\infty)$.

Remark 2.4. Let $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{D})$ be a function which does not vanish identically in $\mathbb{D}$. Then Φ is an outer function in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$. If $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{D})$, then Φ is a normalized outer function in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$.

In view of Remark 2.3 and Remark 2.4 one can conclude the following.

Remark 2.5. Let $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{D})$. Then $\Phi + 1$ is a function belonging to $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{D})$ which vanishes nowhere in $\mathbb{D}$. Thus, $\Phi + 1$ and $(\Phi + 1)^{-1}$ are outer functions in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $w : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be an m -integrable function which satisfies the Szegő condition*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln[w(t)] m(dt) > -\infty. \quad (2.1)$$

Then there is a unique normalized outer function D in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$ such that the relation $|\underline{D}|^2 = w$ holds m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. This function $D : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is given by

$$D(\zeta) = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{t + \zeta}{t - \zeta} \ln[w(t)] m(dt) \right\}. \quad (2.2)$$

The function D which appears in Proposition 2.6 is called the Szegő function associated with w (see also Nikishin/Sorokin [14, Chapter 5 in §5]).

Clearly, the Schur class $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ is a subclass of $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$. A function $I \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ is called an inner function if the relation $|\underline{I}| = 1$ holds m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. We denote by $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ the subclass of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ consisting of all inner functions.

Proposition 2.7. (V. I. Smirnov)

Let $h \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$. Then there exists an outer function E in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$ and some functions $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ such that

$$h = E \cdot I_1 \cdot I_2^{-1}.$$

In the case of $h \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$, I_2 can be chosen as constant function with value 1.

Remark 2.8. Let E be an outer function in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$ which also belongs to $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$. Then E is a constant function with unimodular value.

Now we recall the concept of pseudocontinuity. Let $h \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$. Then one says that h admits a pseudocontinuation into $\mathbb{E}$ if there exists a function $h^\# \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{E})$ such that the boundary functions $\underline{h}$ and $\underline{h^\#}$ coincide m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. From Remark 2.2 it follows that a function $h \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ admits at most one pseudocontinuation into $\mathbb{E}$. Note that if $h \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ admits a pseudocontinuation $h^\#$ into $\mathbb{E}$ and if h is analytically continuable through some open arc of $\mathbb{T}$, then the

analytic continuation coincides with $h^\#$. In the following, the notation $\Pi(\mathbb{D})$ stands for the set of all functions belonging to $\mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ which admit a pseudocontinuation into $\mathbb{E}$. Obviously, the restriction of a rational function onto $\mathbb{D}$ belongs to $\Pi(\mathbb{D})$. If $h \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$, then the symbol $h^\#$ will be used to denote the pseudocontinuation of h into $\mathbb{E}$.

Based on Remark 2.1 one can draw the following conclusion.

Remark 2.9. If $h \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$, then $(h^\#)^\wedge \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ and $\underline{(h^\#)^\wedge} = \underline{h}^*$ m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Moreover, if $h \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ such that there is some $H \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ fulfilling the relation $\underline{H} = \underline{h}^*$ m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$, then $h \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$ and $h^\# = H^\wedge$.

Remark 2.9 shows, in particular, that a function $h \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ belongs to $\Pi(\mathbb{D})$ if and only if there exists some $H \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ fulfilling $\underline{H} = \underline{h}^*$ m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Thus, the pseudocontinuity of h is determined by $\underline{h}^*$.

The following properties of the class $\Pi(\mathbb{D})$ can be easily checked.

Remark 2.10. Let $g, h \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$. If $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, then $\alpha g + \beta h \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$. Moreover, the function gh and, in the case that h does not vanish identically in $\mathbb{D}$, also h^{-1} and gh^{-1} belong to $\Pi(\mathbb{D})$.

A particular situation is met in the class $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ of inner functions belonging to $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$. In this case we not only have pseudocontinuity, but can write down the corresponding pseudocontinuation, explicitly.

Remark 2.11. The inclusion $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D}) \subseteq \Pi(\mathbb{D})$ holds. Moreover, for some $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ the function $\hat{I}$ does not vanish identically in $\mathbb{E}$ and $I^\# = (\hat{I})^{-1}$.

A combination of Remarks 2.10 and 2.11 yields the following.

Remark 2.12. Let $h \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ and let the outer function E in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$ be chosen according to Proposition 2.7. Then $h \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$ if and only if $E \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$.

Remark 2.12 indicates the importance of the study of pseudocontinuity of outer functions in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$. This phenomenon can be characterized in the following way in terms of inner functions belonging to $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$.

Proposition 2.13. *Let D be an outer function in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$. Then $D \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$ if and only if there exist functions $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ such that the identity*

$$\underline{D} \cdot (\underline{D}^*)^{-1} = \underline{I_2} \cdot \underline{I_1}^{-1} \quad (2.3)$$

is satisfied m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$.

Proof. Let $D \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$. Then the pseudocontinuation $D^\#$ of D into $\mathbb{E}$ is well-defined and we set $H := (D^\#)^\wedge$. From Remark 2.9 we get $H \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ and

$$\underline{H} = \underline{D}^*. \quad (2.4)$$

Because of $H \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ the canonical factorization theorem of Smirnov (see Proposition 2.7) provides us with the existence of an outer function E in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$ and two functions $J_1, J_2 \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ such that

$$H = E \cdot J_1 \cdot J_2^{-1}. \quad (2.5)$$

In view of Remark 2.3 the function E vanishes nowhere in $\mathbb{D}$ and $F := DE^{-1}$ is an outer function in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$. Because of (2.5) we obtain

$$F = D \cdot H^{-1} \cdot J_1 \cdot J_2^{-1}.$$

Thus, using (2.4) we infer

$$\underline{F} = \underline{D} \cdot (\underline{D}^*)^{-1} \cdot \underline{J}_1 \cdot \underline{J}_2^{-1} \quad (2.6)$$

m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Since $\underline{J}_1$ and $\underline{J}_2$ are both unimodular m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$ from (2.6) one can see that $\underline{F}$ is unimodular m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Furthermore, since we already know that F is an outer function in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$ the maximum modulus principle of Smirnov (see, e.g., Duren [9, Theorem 2.11 on page 25]) implies that F belongs to $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ as well. Hence, Remark 2.8 shows that F is a constant function with unimodular value. Consequently, the settings $I_2 := FJ_2$ and $I_1 := J_1$ yield functions belonging to $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ such that (2.3) holds m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Conversely, we assume that there exist functions $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ such that (2.3) is satisfied m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Let $H := DI_1I_2^{-1}$. Then $H \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ and in view of (2.3) we get

$$\underline{H} = \underline{D}^*.$$

This leads, in combination with Remark 2.9, to $D \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$. $\square$

It should be mentioned that in the above proof of the fact that the validity of (2.3) m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$ implies $D \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$ we do not use the assumption that D is an outer function in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$.

3. A function-theoretic approach to study the pseudocontinuability in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D}) \setminus \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$

In the present section we investigate the pseudocontinuability of a non-inner function $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ in terms of the function $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{D})$ and the measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$ which is generated by Θ as explained in Section 1. The following result provides us with further insight into the connection between functions Θ and Φ .

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ and let $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{D})$ be defined via (1.1). Then $\Theta \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$ if and only if $\Phi \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$.*

Proof. Taking into account (1.1) and (1.6) an application of Remark 2.10 yields the asserted equivalence. $\square$

The rest of this section is devoted to the study of pseudocontinuability of a non-inner function $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ in terms of its associated measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$. Our approach to that question will be based on an analysis of various aspects of the boundary behavior of Θ . In particular, the m -integrability of the function $\ln[1 - |\underline{\Theta}|^2]$ will be of importance.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D}) \cap \Pi(\mathbb{D})$ and let $h := 1 - \Theta(\Theta^\#)^\wedge$. Then:*

- (a) *The function h belongs to $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$ and satisfies $\underline{h} = 1 - |\underline{\Theta}|^2$ m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$.*

(b) If $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D}) \setminus \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$, then the function $\ln \underline{h}$ is m -integrable.

Proof. Using some elementary properties on the class $\mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ with a view to Remark 2.9, assertion (a) follows. Now let $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D}) \setminus \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$. Because of (a) one can see that the function $\underline{h}$ does not vanish m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Therefore, the function h does not vanish identically in $\mathbb{D}$. Consequently, Remark 2.2 provides finally assertion (b). $\square$

Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ be embedded in the triple $[\Theta, \Phi, \mu]$ as in Section 1. Motivated by Proposition 3.2 our next considerations are aimed at characterizing the m -integrability of the function $\ln[1 - |\underline{\Theta}|^2]$ in terms of the function Φ or the measure μ .

Remark 3.3. Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ and let $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{D})$ be defined by (1.1). Then a straightforward calculation yields that the identity

$$1 - |\underline{\Theta}(t)|^2 = \frac{4\operatorname{Re}[\underline{\Phi}(t)]}{|\underline{\Phi}(t) + 1|^2}$$

holds m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ and let $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{D})$ be defined by (1.1). Then the function $\ln[1 - |\underline{\Theta}|^2]$ is m -integrable if and only if $\ln[\operatorname{Re} \underline{\Phi}]$ is m -integrable.*

Proof. Because of Remark 3.3 we get

$$\ln[1 - |\underline{\Theta}|^2] = \ln 4 + \ln[\operatorname{Re} \underline{\Phi}] - 2 \ln|\underline{\Phi} + 1| \quad (3.1)$$

m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. In view of Remark 2.5 we know that $\Phi + 1$ is an outer function in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{D})$. Thus, Remark 2.3 implies in combination with Remark 2.2 that $\ln|\underline{\Phi} + 1|$ is m -integrable. Hence, the assertion is an immediate consequence of (3.1). $\square$

Following D.Z. Arov we denote by $\mathcal{S}\Pi(\mathbb{D})$ the subclass of pseudocontinuable functions of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$.

Corollary 3.5. *Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}\Pi(\mathbb{D}) \setminus \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ and let $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{D})$ be defined by (1.1). Then the function $\ln[\operatorname{Re} \underline{\Phi}]$ is m -integrable.*

Proof. Combine part (b) of Proposition 3.2 with Proposition 3.4. $\square$

Now we start from a function $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{D})$ and look to characterize the m -integrability of $\ln[\operatorname{Re} \underline{\Phi}]$ in terms of its Riesz-Herglotz measure μ associated with Φ , subject to (1.7). In order to realize this goal we will apply the following result which is an immediate consequence of a theorem due to Fatou on the boundary behavior of Poisson integrals (see, e.g., Rosenblum/Rovnyak [15, Theorem 1.18]).

Proposition 3.6. *Let $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{D})$ and let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$ be associated with Φ by the Riesz-Herglotz Theorem, i.e. via (1.7) with $\beta = \operatorname{Im}[\Phi(0)]$. Furthermore, let the Lebesgue decomposition of μ with respect to m be given by*

$$\mu(dt) = w(t)m(dt) + \mu_s(dt), \quad (3.2)$$

where μ_s stands for the singular part of μ with respect to m . Then the relation $\operatorname{Re} \underline{\Phi} = w$ holds m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$.

Proposition 3.6 leads us to a particular subclass of $\mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$.

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$ and let the Lebesgue decomposition of μ with respect to m be given by (3.2), where μ_s stands for the singular part of μ with respect to m . Then μ is said to satisfy the Szegő condition if the function $\ln w$ is m -integrable or equivalently if (2.1) holds. In this case, the Szegő function $D : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ associated with w is given by (2.2). If we start from a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$ which satisfies the Szegő condition, we will call D also the Szegő function associated with μ .

An application of Proposition 3.6 immediately provides the following result.

Corollary 3.7. *Let $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{D})$ and let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$ be associated with Φ by the Riesz-Herglotz theorem via (1.7) with $\beta = \text{Im} [\Phi(0)]$. Then the function $\ln[\text{Re } \underline{\Phi}]$ is m -integrable if and only if the measure μ satisfies the Szegő condition.*

Lemma 3.8. *Let Φ and D be functions belonging to $\mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ which do not vanish identically in $\mathbb{D}$, where the relation $\text{Re } \underline{\Phi} = |\underline{D}|^2$ is satisfied m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Then $\Phi \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$ if and only if $D \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$.*

Proof. First suppose $\Phi \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$. Then we define

$$H := \frac{1}{2}[\Phi + (\Phi^\#)^\wedge] \cdot D^{-1}$$

In view of the choice of Φ and D , Remark 2.1, and the fact that the set $\mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ is an algebra over $\mathbb{C}$ it follows that $H \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$. Moreover, an application of Remark 2.9 yields the equality $(\Phi^\#)^\wedge = \Phi^*$ m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Hence, $\underline{H} = \underline{D}^*$ m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Taking this and $H \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ into account from Remark 2.9 we get $D \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$. Conversely, we suppose now that $D \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$. We then set

$$G := 2D \cdot (D^\#)^\wedge - \Phi$$

Similar to the above, using Remark 2.1, one can reason that $G \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$, where Remark 2.9 results firstly in $\underline{G} = \underline{\Phi}^*$ m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Thus, from Remark 2.9 we can conclude $\Phi \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$. $\square$

The following criterion for the pseudocontinuity of a non-inner function $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ is the main result of this section. It is formulated in terms of the probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$ which is associated with Θ as explained in Section 1.

Theorem 3.9. *Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D}) \setminus \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ and let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$ be the measure associated with Θ according to Section 1. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $\Theta \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$.
- (ii) *The measure μ satisfies the Szegő condition and the Szegő function D associated with μ belongs to $\Pi(\mathbb{D})$.*

Proof. Let $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{D})$ be defined by (1.1). Assume that the measure μ satisfies the Szegő condition. Hence, from Proposition 2.6 we infer that the Szegő function D associated with μ belongs to $\mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$. Moreover, the combination of Proposition 2.6 and Proposition 3.6 yields the equality

$$\text{Re } \underline{\Phi} = |\underline{D}|^2 \tag{3.3}$$

m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Suppose now that (i) holds. Then from Proposition 3.1 we get

$$\Phi \in \Pi(\mathbb{D}). \quad (3.4)$$

Moreover, in view of (i) and Corollary 3.5, the function $\ln[\operatorname{Re} \underline{\Phi}]$ is m -integrable. Thus, Corollary 3.7 shows that μ satisfies the Szegő condition. Consequently, (3.3) is satisfied. By virtue of (3.3), (3.4), and Lemma 3.8 it follows that $D \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$. So we have verified that (i) implies (ii). Conversely, we suppose now that (ii) holds. From (ii) we obtain (3.3) and $D \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$. Therefore, Lemma 3.8 yields (3.4). Accordingly, an application of Proposition 3.1 supplies $\Theta \in \Pi(\mathbb{D})$, i.e. (i). $\square$

4. An operator– theoretic approach to study the pseudocontinability in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D}) \setminus \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$

The starting point of this section is the observation that a given Schur function $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ can be represented as characteristic function of some contraction in a Hilbert space. That means that there exists a separable complex Hilbert space and bounded linear operators $T : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$, $F : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$, $G : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, and $S : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that the block operator

$$U := \begin{pmatrix} T & F \\ G & S \end{pmatrix} : \mathfrak{H} \oplus \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H} \oplus \mathbb{C} \quad (4.1)$$

is unitary and moreover that the equality

$$\Theta(\zeta) = S + \zeta G(I - \zeta T)^{-1} F, \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{D}, \quad (4.2)$$

is fulfilled. Note that in (4.1) the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ is considered as the one-dimensional complex Hilbert space with the usual inner product

$$(z, w)_{\mathbb{C}} = z^* w, \quad z, w \in \mathbb{C}.$$

The unitarity of the operator U implies that the operator T is contractive (i.e. $\|T\| \leq 1$). Thus, for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$ the operator $I - \zeta T$ is boundedly invertible. The unitarity of the operator U means that the ordered tuple

$$\Delta = (\mathfrak{H}, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}; T, F, G, S) \quad (4.3)$$

is a unitary colligation. In view of (4.2) the function Θ is the characteristic operator function of the unitary colligation Δ .

The following subspaces of $\mathfrak{H}$ will later play an important role

$$\mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{F}} := \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} T^n F(\mathbb{C}), \quad \mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{G}} := \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} (T^*)^n G^*(\mathbb{C}). \quad (4.4)$$

By the symbol $\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n$ we mean the smallest closed subspace generated by the subsets A_n of the corresponding vector spaces. The spaces $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{F}}$ and $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{G}}$ are called

the subspaces of controllability and observability, respectively. We note that the unitary operator U can be chosen such that

$$\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{F}} \vee \mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{G}} \quad (4.5)$$

holds. In this case the unitary colligation Δ is called simple. The simplicity of a unitary colligation means that there does not exist a nontrivial invariant subspace of $\mathfrak{H}$ on which the operator T induces a unitary operator. Such contractions, T , are called completely non-unitary.

In the language of unitary colligations the pseudocontinuability of a non-inner Schur function $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ has the following consequence.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}\Pi(\mathbb{D}) \setminus \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ and let Δ be a simple unitary colligation, (4.3) the characteristic operator function of which coincides with Θ . Then the subspaces*

$$\mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{F}}^{\perp} := \mathfrak{H} \ominus \mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{F}}, \quad \mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{G}}^{\perp} := \mathfrak{H} \ominus \mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{G}} \quad (4.6)$$

are nontrivial.

Because of (4.4) and (4.6) it follows that the subspace $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{G}}^{\perp}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{F}}^{\perp}$) is invariant with respect to T (resp. T^*). It can be shown (see [7, Chapter 1]) that

$$V_T := \text{Rstr}_{\mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{G}}^{\perp}} T, \quad V_{T^*} := \text{Rstr}_{\mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{F}}^{\perp}} T^*$$

are unilateral shifts. More precisely, V_T (resp. V_{T^*}) is just the maximal unilateral shift contained in T (resp. T^*). This means that an arbitrary invariant subspace with respect to T (resp. T^*) on which T (resp. T^*) induces a unilateral shift is contained in $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{G}}^{\perp}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{F}}^{\perp}$).

In terms of unitary colligations the pseudocontinuability of a non-inner Schur function $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ was characterized in [3, Theorem 3.17] as follows.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ and let Δ be a simple unitary colligation (4.3), the characteristic operator function of which coincides with Θ . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $\Theta \in \Pi(\mathbb{D}) \setminus \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$.
- (ii) $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{G}} \cap \mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{F}}^{\perp} \neq \{0\}$.
- (iii) $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{F}} \cap \mathfrak{H}_{\mathfrak{G}}^{\perp} \neq \{0\}$.

A comparison of Theorem 3.9 and Theorem 4.2 shows that they contain rather different characterizations of the pseudocontinuability of a non-inner Schur function $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$. Our subsequent considerations are aimed at establishing direct connections between the two different criteria.

5. A unitary colligation associated with a Borel probability measure on the unit circle

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$. Then our subsequent considerations are concerned with the investigation of the unitary operator $U_\mu^\times$ which is defined for $f \in L_\mu^2$ by

$$(U_\mu^\times f)(t) := \frac{1}{t} \cdot f(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{T}. \quad (5.1)$$

Denote by τ the embedding operator of $\mathbb{C}$ into L_μ^2 , i.e. $\tau : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow L_\mu^2$ and for each $c \in \mathbb{C}$ the image $\tau(c)$ of c is the constant function on $\mathbb{T}$ with value c . Denote by $\mathbb{C}_\mathbb{T}$ the subspace of L_μ^2 which is generated by the constant functions and denote by $\mathbf{1}$ the constant function on $\mathbb{T}$ with value 1. Then obviously $\tau(\mathbb{C}) = \mathbb{C}_\mathbb{T}$ and $\tau(1) = \mathbf{1}$.

We consider the subspace

$$\mathfrak{H}_\mu := L_\mu^2 \ominus \mathbb{C}_\mathbb{T}.$$

Denote by

$$U_\mu^\times = \begin{pmatrix} T^\times & F^\times \\ G^\times & S^\times \end{pmatrix}$$

the block representation of the operator $U_\mu^\times$ with respect to the orthogonal decomposition $L_\mu^2 = \mathfrak{H}_\mu \oplus \mathbb{C}_\mathbb{T}$. Then (see [7, Section 2.8]) the following result holds.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$. Define $T_\mu := T^\times$, $F_\mu := F^\times \tau$, $G_\mu := \tau^* G^\times$, and $S_\mu := \tau^* S^\times \tau$. Then*

$$\Delta_\mu := (\mathfrak{H}_\mu, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}; T_\mu, F_\mu, G_\mu, S_\mu) \quad (5.2)$$

is a simple unitary colligation, the characteristic function Θ_{Δ_μ} of which coincides with the Schur function Θ associated with μ .

In view of Theorem 5.1 the operator T_μ is a completely non-unitary contraction and if the function Φ is given by (1.7) with $\beta = 0$, then from (1.6) it follows that

$$\zeta \Theta_{\Delta_\mu}(\zeta) = \frac{\Phi(\zeta) - 1}{\Phi(\zeta) + 1}, \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Definition 5.2. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$. Then the simple unitary colligation given by (5.2) is called the unitary colligation associated with μ .

6. Completion of the system of orthogonal polynomials in the space L_μ^2 in the case of non-completeness

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$ and suppose that the measure μ has infinitely many points of growth. Furthermore, we use, for all integers n , the mapping $e_n : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$e_n(t) := t^n. \quad (6.1)$$

Thus, we have $e_{-n} = (U_\mu^\times)^n \mathbf{1}$, where $U_\mu^\times$ is the operator defined by (5.1). We now consider the system $\{e_0, e_{-1}, e_{-2}, \dots\}$. Applying the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization method in the space L_μ^2 we get a unique sequence $(\varphi_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ of polynomials, where

$$\varphi_n(t) = \alpha_{n,n}t^{-n} + \alpha_{n,n-1}t^{-(n-1)} + \dots + \alpha_{n,0}, \quad t \in \mathbb{T}, \quad n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}, \quad (6.2)$$

such that the conditions

$$\bigvee_{k=0}^n \varphi_k = \bigvee_{k=0}^n (U_\mu^\times)^k \mathbf{1}, \quad ((U_\mu^\times)^n \mathbf{1}, \varphi_n)_{L_\mu^2} > 0, \quad n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}, \quad (6.3)$$

are satisfied. Here and in the following, if $(h_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ is some family of elements of L_μ^2 , then the symbol $\bigvee_{\alpha \in A} h_\alpha$ stands for the smallest closed subspace in L_μ^2 which contains all elements of this family. We note that the second condition in (6.3) is equivalent to $(\mathbf{1}, \varphi_0)_{L_\mu^2} > 0$ and

$$(U_\mu^\times \varphi_{n-1}, \varphi_n)_{L_\mu^2} > 0, \quad n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}. \quad (6.4)$$

In particular, since $\mu(\mathbb{T}) = 1$ from the construction of φ_0 we see that

$$\varphi_0 = \mathbf{1}. \quad (6.5)$$

We consider the case that the system $(\varphi_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ is non-complete in the space L_μ^2 . In this case the question arises as to the existence of a natural completion of this system to a complete orthonormal system in L_μ^2 . The main goal of this section is to construct such a natural completion.

With a view to the Lebesgue decomposition (3.2), where μ_s stands for the singular part of μ with respect to m , it is well known (see, e.g., Rosenblum/Rovnyak [15, Chapter 4]) that the system of polynomials (6.2) is non-complete in L_μ^2 if and only if the Szegő condition (2.1) is satisfied. In particular, in the case studied below, the Szegő function $D : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which is given by (2.2) is well-defined.

Remark 6.1. Denote by E_{μ_s} a support of the measure μ_s on $\mathbb{T}$ and denote by E' the set of all points of $\mathbb{T}$, where the function D does not have non-tangential boundary values. Let $E := E_{\mu_s} \cup E'$. Then $m(E) = 0$. Thus (see Hoffman [11, Exercise 3 in Chapter 4]), we can choose a boundary function $\underline{D}$ of D which satisfies

$$\underline{D}(t) = 0, \quad t \in E,$$

and

$$\underline{D}(t) \neq 0, \quad t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus E.$$

To construct the above-mentioned completion we consider a simple unitary colligation Δ_μ of type (5.2) associated with the measure μ . Here the completion of the orthonormal system (6.2) of polynomials to a complete orthonormal system in L_μ^2 will be determined in a natural way by properties of the operator T_μ .

We note that the controllability space (cf. (4.4)) associated with the unitary colligation Δ_μ has the form

$$\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}} = \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} (T_\mu)^n F_\mu(1).$$

Let the sequence of functions $(\varphi'_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ be defined by

$$\varphi'_k := T_\mu^{k-1} F_\mu(1), \quad k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}. \quad (6.6)$$

In view of the formula

$$\bigvee_{k=0}^n (U_\mu^\times)^k \mathbf{1} = \left(\bigvee_{k=0}^{n-1} (T_\mu)^k F_\mu(1) \right) \oplus \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}, \quad n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}, \quad (6.7)$$

it can be seen that the sequence $(\varphi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ can be obtained by applying the Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization procedure to $(\varphi'_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ with additional consideration of the normalization condition (6.4). Thus, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 6.2. *The system $(\varphi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ of orthonormal polynomials is a basis in the space $\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}$. This system can be obtained by applying the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization procedure to the sequence (6.6), taking into account the normalization condition (6.4).*

Corollary 6.3. *The orthonormal system of polynomials $(\varphi_k)_{k=0}^\infty$ is non-complete in L_μ^2 if and only if $\mathfrak{H}_\mu \ominus \mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}} \neq \{0\}$.*

If T is a contraction acting on some Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$, then we set

$$\delta_T := \dim \mathfrak{D}_T \quad (\text{resp. } \delta_{T^*} := \dim \mathfrak{D}_{T^*}),$$

where $\mathfrak{D}_T := \overline{D_T(\mathfrak{H})}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{D}_{T^*} := \overline{D_{T^*}(\mathfrak{H})}$) is the closure of the range of the defect operator $D_T := \sqrt{I_\mathfrak{H} - T^*T}$ (resp. $D_{T^*} := \sqrt{I_\mathfrak{H} - TT^*}$).

Let $\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp := \mathfrak{H}_\mu \ominus \mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}$ (cf. (4.6)). Then the space $\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp$ is invariant with respect to T_μ^* and moreover, if $\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp \neq \{0\}$, then the restriction

$$V_{T_\mu^*} := \text{Rstr.}_{\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp} T_\mu^*$$

is the maximal unilateral shift contained in T_μ^* (see [7, Theorem 1.6]).

We now suppose that $\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp \neq \{0\}$. In view of $\delta_{T_\mu} = \delta_{T_\mu^*} = 1$, the multiplicity of the unilateral shift $V_{T_\mu^*}$ is equal 1 and coincides with δ_{T_μ} . This is equivalent to the operator T_μ containing a maximal unilateral shift V_{T_μ} of multiplicity 1 (see [7, Remark 1.11]). Thus, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 6.4. *The orthonormal system of polynomials $(\varphi_k)_{k=0}^\infty$ is non-complete in L_μ^2 if and only if the contraction T_μ (resp. T_μ^*) contains a maximal unilateral shift V_{T_μ} (resp. $V_{T_\mu^*}$) of multiplicity 1.*

We consider the orthogonal decomposition

$$\mathfrak{H}_\mu = \mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}} \oplus \mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp. \quad (6.8)$$

Denote by $\tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_0$ the wandering subspace which generates the subspace associated with the unilateral shift $V_{T_\mu^*}$. Then $\dim \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_0 = 1$ and since $V_{T_\mu^*}$ is an isometric operator we have

$$V_{T_\mu^*} = \text{Rstr.}_{\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp} (U_\mu^\times)^*. \quad (6.9)$$

Consequently,

$$\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} V_{T_\mu^*}^n(\tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_0) = \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} (T_\mu^*)^n(\tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_0) = \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} [(U_\mu^\times)^*]^n(\tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_0). \quad (6.10)$$

There exists (see [7, Corollary 1.10]) a unique unit vector $\psi_1 \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_0$ which fulfills

$$(G_\mu^*(1), \psi_1)_{L_\mu^2} > 0. \quad (6.11)$$

Because of (6.9), (6.10), and (6.11) it follows that the sequence $(\psi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$, where

$$\psi_k := [(U_\mu^\times)^*]^{k-1} \psi_1, \quad k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}, \quad (6.12)$$

is the unique orthonormal basis of the space $\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp$ which satisfies the conditions

$$(G_\mu^*(1), \psi_1)_{L_\mu^2} > 0, \quad \psi_{k+1} = (U_\mu^\times)^* \psi_k, \quad k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}, \quad (6.13)$$

or equivalently

$$(G_\mu^*(1), \psi_1)_{L_\mu^2} > 0, \quad \psi_{k+1}(t) = t^k \cdot \psi_1(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{T}, \quad k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}. \quad (6.14)$$

As in the paper [7] we introduce the following notion.

Definition 6.5. The constructed orthonormal basis

$$\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots; \psi_1, \psi_2, \dots \quad (6.15)$$

in the space L_μ^2 which satisfies the conditions (6.3) and (6.13) is called the canonical orthonormal basis in L_μ^2 .

Obviously, the canonical orthonormal basis (6.15) in L_μ^2 is uniquely determined by the conditions (6.3) and (6.13). Here the sequence $(\varphi_k)_{k=0}^\infty$ is an orthonormal system of polynomials (depending on t^{-1}). The orthonormal system $(\psi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ is built with the aid of the operator $U_\mu^\times$ from the function ψ_1 (see (6.12)) in similar to the way the system $(\varphi_k)_{k=0}^\infty$ was built from the function φ_0 (see (6.2) and (6.3)). The only difference is that the system $([(U_\mu^\times)^*]^k \psi_1)_{k=0}^\infty$ is orthonormal, whereas in the general case the system $((U_\mu^\times)^k \varphi_0)_{k=0}^\infty$ is not orthonormal. In this respect the sequence $(\psi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ can be considered as a natural completion of the system of orthonormal polynomials $(\varphi_k)_{k=0}^\infty$ to an orthonormal basis in L_μ^2 .

It should be mentioned that the part $(\psi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ of (6.15) has a clear interpretation in terms of prediction theory of stationary sequences. A closer look at the papers Wiener/Masani [23] and [24] shows that $(\psi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ is the spectral image of

the sequence of so-called normalized innovations corresponding to some stationary sequence which is naturally associated with L_μ^2 . We hope to discuss this and related matters in a separate paper dedicated to a prediction-theoretical analysis of pseudocontinuity of Schur functions.

Remark 6.6. The orthonormal system

$$\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots; \psi_1, \psi_2, \dots \quad (6.16)$$

is an orthonormal basis in the space $\mathfrak{H}_\mu$, which takes the orthogonal decomposition of $\mathfrak{H}_\mu$ into account. We will call it the canonical orthonormal basis in $\mathfrak{H}_\mu$.

In view of (6.14), to obtain a description of the sequence $(\psi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ it suffices to determine ψ_1 . The above considerations lead us to the following result.

Lemma 6.7. *The function $\psi_1 \in L_\mu^2$ is completely characterized by the following four conditions:*

- (a) $\psi_1 \perp \mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}$.
- (b) $\|\psi_1\| = 1$.
- (c) $((V_{T_\mu^*})^k \psi_1)_{k=0}^\infty$ is an orthonormal basis in $\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp$.
- (d) $(G_\mu^*(1), \psi_1)_{L_\mu^2} > 0$.

Remark 6.8. In view of Theorem 6.2 condition (a) in Lemma 6.7 is equivalent to the orthogonality conditions in L_μ^2 which are expressed by

$$\psi_1 \perp \varphi_k, \quad k \in \{1, 2, \dots\},$$

or equivalently

$$\psi_1 \perp e_{-k}, \quad k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}.$$

Now we are going to prove another auxiliary result. Here and in the following, for any function $f : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we simply write $f^*(t)$ instead of $(f(t))^*$.

Lemma 6.9. *Assume that $h_0 \in L_\mu^2$ satisfies the following three conditions:*

- (ã) $h_0 \perp \mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}$.
- (b̃) $\|h_0\| = 1$.
- (c̃) $((V_{T_\mu^*})^k h_0)_{k=0}^\infty$ is an orthonormal system in $\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp$.

Suppose that μ has the Lebesgue decomposition (3.2) and let $D : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the Szegő function given by (2.2). Denote by E the Borel subset of $\mathbb{T}$ which was introduced in Remark 6.1. Then there is a function $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ such that the function h_0 has the form

$$h_0(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \in E, \\ t \cdot (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1} \cdot \underline{I}(t), & t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus E. \end{cases} \quad (6.17)$$

Proof. In view of Remark 6.8 from condition (ã) we infer

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} t^k h_0(t) \mu(dt) = (h_0, e_{-k})_{L_\mu^2} = 0, \quad k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}. \quad (6.18)$$

Moreover, from $(\tilde{c})$ and $(V_{T_\mu^*})^0 h_0 = h_0$ we also have $h_0 \in \mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp$. Thus, in view of (6.8) we get $h_0 \in \mathfrak{H}_\mu$. This yields $h_0 \perp \mathbb{C}_\mathbb{T}$. Therefore, it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} t^0 h_0(t) \mu(dt) = (h_0, e_0)_{L_\mu^2} = 0. \quad (6.19)$$

By using the Riesz brothers' theorem (see, e.g., Hoffman [11, Chapter 4]) we obtain from (6.18) and (6.19) we obtain that the complex measure $\bar{t}h_0(t)\mu(dt)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to m . According to the decomposition (3.2) this implies

$$h_0(t) = 0, \quad t \in E_{\mu_s}. \quad (6.20)$$

The function h_0 is determined m -a.e. on the set $\mathbb{T} \setminus E_{\mu_s}$. For this reason, taking into account Remark 6.1 and (6.20), we can assume that

$$h_0(t) = 0, \quad t \in E. \quad (6.21)$$

Because of (3.2), (6.20), and the condition $(\tilde{c})$ for each $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ it follows

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} t^n |h_0(t)|^2 |\underline{D}(t)|^2 m(dt) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} t^n |h_0(t)|^2 \mu(dt) = ((V_{T_\mu^*})^n h_0, h_0)_{L_\mu^2} = 0.$$

Consequently, taking complex conjugates for each non-zero integer n , we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} t^n |h_0(t)|^2 |\underline{D}(t)|^2 m(dt) = 0.$$

Hence, there is a constant $c \in \mathbb{C}$ such that the identity

$$|h_0|^2 |\underline{D}|^2 = c \quad (6.22)$$

holds m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Combining $(\tilde{b})$ with (3.2), (6.20), and (6.22) we can conclude

$$1 = \|h_0\|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{T}} |h_0(t)|^2 \mu(dt) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} |h_0(t)|^2 |\underline{D}(t)|^2 m(dt) = c.$$

Therefore, from (6.22) it follows that

$$|h_0| = |\underline{D}|^{-1} \quad (6.23)$$

m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T} \setminus E$. From (6.23) and Proposition 2.6 we see that $e_{-1} h_0 |\underline{D}|^2 \in L_m^2$. Using (3.2), (6.20), (6.18), and (6.19) we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} t^n t^{-1} h_0(t) |\underline{D}(t)|^2 m(dt) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} t^{n-1} h_0(t) \mu(dt) = 0, \quad n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}.$$

Thus, by setting $L_{m,+}^2 := \bigvee_{n=0}^\infty e_n$ we get

$$e_{-1} \cdot h_0 \cdot |\underline{D}|^2 \in (L_{m,+}^2)^\perp. \quad (6.24)$$

In view of (6.23), the identity

$$|e_{-1} \cdot h_0 \cdot |\underline{D}|^2| = |\underline{D}| \quad (6.25)$$

holds m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Since D is an outer function in $H^2(\mathbb{D})$, it follows from (6.24), (6.25) and the inner-outer factorization (see Proposition 2.7) that the function $e_{-1}h_0|\underline{D}|^2$ admits the representation

$$e_{-1} \cdot h_0 \cdot |\underline{D}|^2 = \underline{D} \cdot \underline{I}$$

m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$ for some $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$. Hence, the identity

$$e_{-1} \cdot h_0 \cdot \underline{D}^* = \underline{I}$$

holds m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Combining this with (6.21) we get the representation (6.17). $\square$

Theorem 6.10. *Let $D : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the Szegő function given by (2.2). Denote by E the Borel subset of $\mathbb{T}$ which was introduced in Remark 6.1. Then the unit vector $\psi_1 \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_0$ which is uniquely determined via (6.11) is given by*

$$\psi_1(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \in E, \\ t \cdot (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1}, & t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus E. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The conditions (a), (b), and (c) in Lemma 6.7 lead in combination with Lemma 6.9 to the relation

$$\psi_1(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \in E, \\ t \cdot (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1} \cdot \underline{I}(t), & t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus E. \end{cases} \quad (6.26)$$

Because of condition (c) in Lemma 6.7, the sequence $((V_{T_\mu}^*)^k \psi_1)_{k=0}^\infty$ is an orthonormal basis in $\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp$, where $(V_{T_\mu}^*)^k \psi_1 = e_k \psi_1$, $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Now we are going to prove that this implies that the function I is constant with unimodular value. We prove this by contradiction. Assume that I is not a unimodular constant function. Then Beurling's Theorem (see, e.g., Garnett [10, Theorem 7.1 in Chapter 2]) implies that the system $\{e_0 \underline{I}, e_1 \underline{I}, e_2 \underline{I}, \dots\}$ is not closed in $L_{m,+}^2$. Thus, there exists an element $u \in L_{m,+}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ which is orthogonal in $L_{m,+}^2$ to the sequence $(e_n \underline{I})_{n=0}^\infty$. Now we show that the function

$$g := \psi_1 \cdot \underline{I}^* \cdot u \quad (6.27)$$

has the following properties

$$g \in \mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}, \quad (6.28)$$

$$g \perp (V_{T_\mu}^*)^n \psi_1, \quad n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}. \quad (6.29)$$

Indeed, since the functions u and $\underline{D}$ belong to $L_{m,+}^2$ from (6.27), (6.26), and the fact that $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ for each $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (g, e_{-k})_{L_\mu^2} &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} t^k \psi_1(t) \underline{I}^*(t) u(t) \mu(dt) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} t^k t (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1} \underline{I}(t) \underline{I}^*(t) u(t) \mu(dt) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} t^{k+1} (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1} u(t) \mu(dt) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} t^{k+1} u(t) \underline{D}(t) m(dt) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies (6.28). Moreover, taking into account (6.27), (6.26), and the choice of u for each $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ one can conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
(g, (V_{T_\mu^*}^k \psi_1)_{L_\mu^2}) &= (g, e_k \psi_1)_{L_\mu^2} = \int_{\mathbb{T}} g(t) (t^k \psi_1(t))^* \mu(dt) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}} g(t) (t^k \psi_1(t))^* |\underline{D}(t)|^2 m(dt) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}} u(t) (\underline{I}(t) t^k)^* |\psi_1(t)|^2 |\underline{D}(t)|^2 m(dt) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}} u(t) (\underline{I}(t) t^k)^* \left| t (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1} \underline{I}(t) \right|^2 |\underline{D}(t)|^2 m(dt) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}} u(t) (t^k \underline{I}(t))^* m(dt) = (u, e_k \underline{I})_{L_m^2} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (6.29) is proved. However, condition (c) in Lemma 6.7 shows that from (6.28) and (6.29) it follows that $g = 0$. Combining this with (6.26) and (6.27) we get

$$e_1 \cdot (\underline{D}^*)^{-1} \cdot u = 0$$

m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T} \setminus E$. Therefore, u vanishes m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T} \setminus E$. Because $m(E) = 0$, this implies that u vanishes m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. This contradicts the assumption that u belongs to $L_{m,+}^2 \setminus \{0\}$. Hence, the function I is constant. Since I is an inner function, there is an $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that I is the constant function with value $\exp\{i\alpha\}$. Thus, formula (6.26) can be rewritten in the form

$$\psi_1(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \in E, \\ \exp\{i\alpha\} \cdot t \cdot (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1}, & t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus E. \end{cases} \quad (6.30)$$

Denote by $P_{\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{T}}}$ the orthoprojector in L_μ^2 onto the closed subspace $\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{T}}$. Using (2.2), (6.30), and (6.11) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
0 < (G_\mu^*(1), \psi_1)_{L_\mu^2} &= (1, G_\mu \psi_1)_{\mathbb{C}} = G_\mu \psi_1 = (0, 1) \begin{pmatrix} T_\mu & F_\mu \\ G_\mu & S_\mu \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\
&= P_{\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{T}}} U_\mu^\times \psi_1 = \int_{\mathbb{T}} t^* \psi_1(t) \mu(dt) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} t^* \psi_1(t) |\underline{D}(t)|^2 m(dt) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}} t^* \left(\exp\{i\alpha\} t (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1} \right) |\underline{D}(t)|^2 m(dt) \\
&= \exp\{i\alpha\} \cdot \int_{\mathbb{T}} \underline{D}(t) m(dt) = \exp\{i\alpha\} \cdot D(0) \\
&= \exp\{i\alpha\} \cdot \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln [w(t)] m(dt) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, it follows $\exp\{i\alpha\} = 1$. □

Corollary 6.11. *For each $k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, the function ψ_k of the canonical orthonormal basis (6.16) in the space $\mathfrak{H}_\mu$ is given by*

$$\psi_k(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \in E, \\ t^k \cdot (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1}, & t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus E. \end{cases} \quad (6.31)$$

Corollary 6.12. *The canonical orthonormal basis (6.15) in the space L_μ^2 consists of the system $(\varphi_k)_{k=0}^\infty$ of orthonormal polynomials (depending on t^{-1}) given by (6.3) and the orthonormal system $(\psi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ given by (6.31).*

Remark 6.13. If μ coincides with the Lebesgue-Borel measure m on $\mathbb{T}$, then the Szegő condition for μ is satisfied and D is the constant function with value 1. Thus,

$$\varphi_k(t) = t^{-k}, \quad k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\},$$

and

$$\psi_k(t) = t^k, \quad k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}.$$

In other words, the canonical orthonormal basis (6.15) in that case is given by

$$e_0, e_{-1}, e_{-2}, \dots; e_1, e_2, \dots,$$

where for each integer n the function $e_n : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is defined as in (6.1).

Corollary 6.14. *The space $\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp$ consists of all functions f of the form*

$$f(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \in E, \\ f_0(t) \cdot (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1}, & t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus E, \end{cases}$$

where f_0 is some function belonging to $L_{m,+}^2$. Thereby,

$$\|f\|_{L_\mu^2} = \|f_0\|_{L_m^2},$$

i.e. the mapping $f \mapsto f_0$ establishes a metric isomorphism between $\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp$ and $L_{m,+}^2$.

Now we consider the case that the measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$ is generated by the pseudocontinuable non-inner function Θ .

Proposition 6.15. *Let $\Theta \in S\Pi(\mathbb{D}) \setminus \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$ be the measure associated with Θ according to Section 1. Then:*

- (a) *The measure μ satisfies the Szegő condition and the Szegő function D associated with μ belongs to $\Pi(\mathbb{D})$.*
- (b) *Denote by $D^\#$ the pseudocontinuation of D . Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For all $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $D^\#$ is holomorphic at $\frac{1}{\zeta^*}$ and satisfies $D^\# \left(\frac{1}{\zeta^*} \right) \neq 0$, we define*

$$\Psi_k(\zeta) := \zeta^k \cdot \frac{1}{\left[D^\# \left(\frac{1}{\zeta^*} \right) \right]^*}$$

Then $\Psi_k(\zeta) \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ and its boundary values $\underline{\Psi}_k$ satisfy $1_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} \underline{\Psi}_k = \psi_k \mu$ -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$, where ψ_k belongs to the canonical orthonormal basis in L_μ^2 which was introduced in Definition 6.5 and where E stands for the Borel subset of $\mathbb{T}$, which was introduced in Remark 6.1.

(c) Let $F \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$ and let

$$G := \frac{F}{(D^\#)^\wedge}.$$

Then $G \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ and its boundary values $\underline{G}$ satisfy

$$1_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} \underline{G} \in \mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp$$

and

$$\|F\|_{H^2(\mathbb{D})} = \|1_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} \underline{G}\|_{L_\mu^2}.$$

The mapping $F \mapsto 1_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} \underline{G}$ is a metric isomorphism between $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ and $\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp$.

Proof. (a) This follows from Theorem 3.9.

(b) In view of Remark 2.9 we have $\Psi_k \in \mathcal{NM}(\mathbb{D})$ and

$$\underline{\Psi}_k(t) = \frac{t^k}{\underline{D}^*(t)} \quad \text{for } m\text{-a.e. } t \in \mathbb{T}. \quad (6.32)$$

Thus, in view of $m(E) = 0$, the combination of (6.32), Theorem 6.10 and (6.14) shows that $1_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} \underline{\Psi}_k = \psi_k$ μ -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$.

(c) Using Corollary 6.14, the assertion of (c) can be obtained analogously to (b). $\square$

Remark 6.16. In [7] a detailed description of the matrix representations of the operators T_μ , F_μ , G_μ , and S_μ (and, consequently, of the operator U_μ) with respect to the canonical basis (6.15) was given (see 2.8 Comment, Chapter A, and Theorems 2.13, 2.15, and 2.17 there). These matrix representations are expressed in terms of Schur parameters of the characteristic function Θ_{Δ_μ} of the unitary colligation which is associated with the probability measure μ . We note that in Chapter 4 of the monograph [19] by B. Simon some historical remarks concerning these matrix representations are presented. In particular, the representation, abbreviated by GGT , is used in [19]. Here GGT stands for Geronimus, Gragg, and Teplyaev.

7. Some criterion of pseudocontinuity of non-inner Schur functions in terms of orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle

It is well known (see, e.g., Brodskii [4]) that one can consider simultaneously together with the simple unitary colligation (5.2) the adjoint unitary colligation

$$\tilde{\Delta}_\mu := (\mathfrak{H}_\mu, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}; T_\mu^*, G_\mu^*, F_\mu^*, S_\mu^*) \quad (7.1)$$

which is also simple. For $z \in \mathbb{D}$, its characteristic function $\Theta_{\tilde{\Delta}_\mu}$ is given by

$$\Theta_{\tilde{\Delta}_\mu}(z) = \Theta_{\Delta_\mu}^*(z^*).$$

We note that the unitary colligation (7.1) is associated with the operator $(U_\mu^\times)^*$. It can be easily checked that the action of $(U_\mu^\times)^*$ is given for each $f \in L_\mu^2$ by

$$[(U_\mu^\times)^* f](t) = t \cdot f(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{T}.$$

If we replace the operator $U_\mu^\times$ by $(U_\mu^\times)^*$ in the preceding considerations, which have lead to the canonical orthonormal basis (6.15), we obtain an orthonormal basis of the space L_μ^2 which consists of two sequences

$$(\tilde{\varphi}_j)_{j=0}^\infty \quad \text{and} \quad (\tilde{\psi}_j)_{j=1}^\infty \quad (7.2)$$

of functions. From our treatments above it follows that the orthonormal basis (7.2) is uniquely determined by the following conditions:

- (a) The sequence $(\tilde{\varphi}_j)_{j=0}^\infty$ arises from the result of the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization procedure of the sequence $([(U_\mu^\times)^*]^n \mathbf{1})_{n=0}^\infty$ while taking into account the normalization conditions

$$([(U_\mu^\times)^*]^n \mathbf{1}, \tilde{\varphi}_n)_{L_\mu^2} > 0, \quad n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}.$$

- (b) The relations

$$(F_\mu(1), \tilde{\psi}_1)_{L_\mu^2} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\psi}_{k+1} = U_\mu^\times \tilde{\psi}_k, \quad k \in \{1, 2, \dots\},$$

hold.

It can be easily checked that

$$\tilde{\varphi}_k = \varphi_k^*, \quad k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\},$$

and

$$\tilde{\psi}_k = \psi_k^*, \quad k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}.$$

As in the paper [7], we introduce the following notion.

Definition 7.1. The orthogonal basis

$$\varphi_0^*, \varphi_1^*, \varphi_2^*, \dots; \psi_1^*, \psi_2^*, \dots \quad (7.3)$$

is called the conjugate canonical orthonormal basis with respect to the canonical orthonormal basis (6.15).

Similar to (6.7), the identity

$$\bigvee_{k=0}^n [(U_\mu^\times)^*]^k \mathbf{1} = \left(\bigvee_{k=0}^{n-1} (T_\mu^*)^k G_\mu^*(1) \right) \oplus \mathbb{C}_\mathbb{T} \quad (7.4)$$

can be verified. Thus,

$$\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}} = \bigvee_{k=1}^\infty \varphi_k, \quad \mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{G}} = \bigvee_{k=1}^\infty \varphi_k^*, \quad (7.5)$$

$$\mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{F}}^\perp = \bigvee_{k=1}^\infty \psi_k, \quad \mathfrak{H}_{\mu, \mathfrak{G}}^\perp = \bigvee_{k=1}^\infty \psi_k^*. \quad (7.6)$$

In [7, Chapter 3] the unitary operator U was introduced which maps the elements of the canonical basis (6.15) onto the corresponding elements of the conjugate canonical basis (7.3). More precisely,

$$U\varphi_n = \varphi_n^*, \quad n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}, \quad \text{and} \quad U\psi_n = \psi_n^*, \quad n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}.$$

The operator U is related to the conjugation operator in L_μ^2 . Namely, if $f \in L_\mu^2$ and

$$f = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k \varphi_k + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_k \psi_k,$$

then

$$f^* = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k^* \varphi_k^* + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_k^* \psi_k^* = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k^* U \varphi_k + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_k^* U \psi_k.$$

In [7, Theorem 3.6] the matrix representation of the blocks of the operator U with respect to the canonical basis (6.15) was expressed in terms of Schur parameters of the characteristic function Θ_{μ_Δ} . A finer analysis of this matrix representation (see [7, Chapters 4 and 5]) yields effective criteria for the pseudocontinuity of a non-inner function belonging to the Schur class $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$. These criteria are formulated in terms of Schur parameters.

Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$. The relations (1.6) and (1.7) allow us to associate a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$ with the function Θ . Furthermore, we associate the simple unitary colligation Δ_μ given by (5.2) with the same measure μ . Then Theorem 5.1 implies $\Theta_{\Delta_\mu} = \Theta$. The unitary colligation Δ_μ suggests that we consider the canonical basis (6.15) and the conjugate canonical basis (7.3) in L_μ^2 . The equations (7.5) and (7.6) allow us to reformulate Theorem 4.2 into the following criterion of pseudocontinuity of non-inner Schur functions in terms of the canonical orthonormal basis of L_μ^2 introduced in Definition 6.5.

Theorem 7.2. *Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D}) \setminus \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ and let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$ be the measure associated with Θ according to Section 1. Let Δ_μ be the simple unitary colligation (5.2) which satisfies $\Theta_{\Delta_\mu} = \Theta$. Furthermore, let the canonical orthogonal basis in L_μ^2 be given by (6.15). Then Θ admits a pseudocontinuation if and only if*

$$\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \varphi_n^* \cap \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi_n \neq \{0\} \quad (7.7)$$

(where the symbol $\vee$ “is used in the context of L_μ^2 ”).

8. A direct connection between the criteria of pseudocontinuity given by Theorems 3.9 and 4.2

The combination of Proposition 2.13 and Theorem 7.2 shows that in order to establish a direct connection between the criteria of pseudocontinuity of functions belonging to $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D}) \setminus \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ which are contained in Theorems 3.9 and 4.2 it is sufficient to verify the following statement.

Theorem 8.1. *Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D}) \setminus \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ and let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{T})$ be the measure associated with Θ according to Section 1. Then condition (7.7) in Theorem 7.2 is fulfilled if and only if the measure μ satisfies the Szegő condition and there exist functions $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ such that the identity (2.3) holds m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$.*

Proof. Let condition (7.7) be satisfied. Then the system $(\varphi_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ is not complete in L_μ^2 . Thus, as mentioned above, condition (2.1) is fulfilled. From the definition of the subspaces $\mathfrak{H}_{\mu,\mathfrak{F}}$ and $\mathfrak{H}_{\mu,\mathfrak{G}}$ (see (4.4) and Section 5) it follows that the subspaces $\mathfrak{H}_{\mu,\mathfrak{G}}$ and $\mathfrak{H}_{\mu,\mathfrak{F}}^\perp$ are invariant with respect to the operator T_μ^* . Moreover, since the unitary colligation $\triangle_\mu$ is simple we get

$$\text{Rstr.}_{\mathfrak{H}_{\mu,\mathfrak{F}}^\perp} T_\mu^* = V_{T_\mu^*}.$$

Taking into account (7.5), (7.6), and (7.7) it follows

$$\mathfrak{N}_{\mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{F}} := \mathfrak{H}_{\mu,\mathfrak{G}} \cap \mathfrak{H}_{\mu,\mathfrak{F}}^\perp = \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \varphi_n^* \cap \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \psi_n \neq \{0\}.$$

Hence, the space $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{F}}$ is also invariant with respect to T_μ^* and the restriction of T_μ^* is a unilateral shift of multiplicity 1. Let h_0 be a basis function of the generating wandering subspace of the unilateral shift $\text{Rstr.}_{\mathfrak{N}_{\mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{F}}} T_\mu^*$. Then the function h_0 satisfies the conditions in Lemma 6.9. Thus, there is a function $\hat{I}_1 \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ such that

$$h_0(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \in E, \\ t \cdot (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1} \cdot \hat{I}_1(t), & t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus E. \end{cases} \quad (8.1)$$

On the other hand, in view of $h_0 \in \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \varphi_n^*$ there exists a sequence $(P_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ of polynomials such that the limit relation

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |h_0(t) - P_n(t)|^2 \mu(dt) = 0$$

holds. This implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}} |h_0(t) \underline{D}(t) - P_n(t) \underline{D}(t)|^2 m(dt) + \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_n(t)|^2 \mu_s(dt) \right\} = 0.$$

Combining this with (8.1) we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| t \cdot \hat{I}_1(t) \cdot \underline{D}(t) \cdot (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1} - P_n(t) \underline{D}(t) \right|^2 m(dt) = 0.$$

Therefore, the unimodular function $\hat{I} : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which is defined by

$$\hat{I}(t) := t \cdot \hat{I}_1(t) \cdot \underline{D}(t) \cdot (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1}$$

is the L_m^2 -limit of the sequence $((\text{Rstr.}_{\mathbb{T}} P_n) \cdot \underline{D})_{n=1}^\infty$. Thus, since the sequence $((\text{Rstr.}_{\mathbb{D}} P_n) \cdot \underline{D})_{n=1}^\infty$ belongs to the Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ and since $\hat{I}$ is a unimodular function, we see that there is a function $I_2 \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ such that its boundary function $\underline{I}_2$ coincides m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$ with $\hat{I}$. Hence, the identity

$$\underline{I}_2(t) = t \cdot \hat{I}_1(t) \cdot \underline{D}(t) \cdot (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1}$$

holds m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. This implies that

$$\underline{D}(t) \cdot (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1} = \underline{I}_2(t) \cdot t^{-1} \cdot (\hat{I}_1(t))^{-1}$$

holds m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. Therefore, if we define the function $I_1 : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$I_1(\zeta) := \zeta \cdot \hat{I}_1(\zeta),$$

then I_1 is a function belonging to $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ such that (2.3) holds m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$.

Conversely, we assume now that the conditions (2.1) and (2.3) are satisfied. Let E be the set introduced in Remark 6.1. In view of $m(E) = 0$ we can assume that the boundary functions $\underline{I}_1$ and $\underline{I}_2$ of the inner functions I_1 and I_2 vanish on E . Thus, the functions $\underline{I}_1$ and $\underline{I}_2$ vanish μ_s -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. From (2.3) it follows that

$$t \cdot \underline{I}_1(t) \cdot (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1} = t \cdot \underline{I}_2(t) \cdot (\underline{D}(t))^{-1} \quad (8.2)$$

holds m -a.e. on $\mathbb{T}$. We are going to prove that the function h_0 defined by

$$h_0(t) := \begin{cases} 0, & t \in E, \\ t \cdot \underline{I}_1(t) \cdot (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1}, & t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus E, \end{cases} \quad (8.3)$$

belongs to the intersection of the sets described on the left-hand side of formula (7.7). Indeed, in view of Corollary 6.14 and (7.6) we infer

$$h_0 \in \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi_n. \quad (8.4)$$

On the other hand, using (8.3), (8.2), (6.31), and $m(E) = 0$ for each $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ one can conclude

$$\begin{aligned} (h_0, \psi_n^*)_{L_\mu^2} &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} h_0(t) \psi_n(t) \mu(dt) = \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} h_0(t) \psi_n(t) d\mu \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} t \underline{I}_1(t) (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1} \psi_n(t) \mu(dt) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} t \underline{I}_2(t) (\underline{D}(t))^{-1} \psi_n(t) \mu(dt) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} t \underline{I}_2(t) (\underline{D}(t))^{-1} t^n (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1} \mu(dt) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} t^{n+1} \underline{I}_2(t) |\underline{D}(t)|^{-2} \mu(dt) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} t^{n+1} \underline{I}_2(t) |\underline{D}(t)|^{-2} |\underline{D}(t)|^2 m(dt) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} t^{n+1} \underline{I}_2(t) m(dt) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} t^{n+1} \underline{I}_2(t) m(dt) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get

$$h_0 \in \left(\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi_n^* \right)^\perp. \quad (8.5)$$

In view of $I_1 D \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$ we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} t \underline{I}_1(t) \underline{D}(t) m(dt) = 0.$$

Consequently, by using (6.5), (8.3), and $m(E) = 0$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (h_0, \varphi_0^*)_{L_\mu^2} &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} h_0(t) \varphi_0(t) \mu(dt) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} h_0(t) \mu(dt) = \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} h_0(t) \mu(dt) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} t \underline{I}_1(t) (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1} \mu(dt) = \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} t \underline{I}_1(t) (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1} |\underline{D}(t)|^2 m(dt) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} t \underline{I}_1(t) \underline{D}(t) m(dt) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} t \underline{I}_1(t) \underline{D}(t) m(dt) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (8.6)$$

Since

$$\varphi_0^*, \varphi_1^*, \varphi_2^*, \dots; \psi_1^*, \psi_2^*, \dots$$

is an orthonormal basis of L_μ^2 from (8.5) and (8.6) it follows that

$$h_0 \in \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \varphi_n^*.$$

Combining this with (8.4) we see that

$$h_0 \in \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \varphi_n^* \cap \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi_n. \quad (8.7)$$

By using $I_1 \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$, $m(E) = 0$, and (8.3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_0\|_{L_\mu^2}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} |h_0(t)|^2 \mu(dt) = \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} |h_0(t)|^2 \mu(dt) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} \left| t \underline{I}_1(t) (\underline{D}^*(t))^{-1} \right|^2 \mu(dt) = \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} |\underline{D}(t)|^{-2} \mu(dt) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus E} |\underline{D}(t)|^{-2} |\underline{D}(t)|^2 m(dt) = m(\mathbb{T} \setminus E) = m(\mathbb{T}) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from (8.7) we see

$$\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \varphi_n^* \cap \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi_n \neq \{0\}.$$

Thus, (7.7) is fulfilled. $\square$

We now look to cast some light on an interesting aspect of pseudocontinuity of Schur functions by considering our main result under the light of the following well-known Douglas-Rudin Theorem (see, e.g., Garnett [10, Theorem 2.1 in Chapter V]).

Theorem 8.2. *Denote by U a unimodular function belonging to the space $L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist functions $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ satisfying*

$$\|U - \underline{I_2} \cdot \underline{I_1}^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})} < \varepsilon.$$

Thus, the combination of Theorem 7.2 with Theorem 8.1 shows that the phenomenon of pseudocontinuity of a non-inner function $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ is related to the fact that for the unimodular function

$$U := \underline{D} \cdot (\underline{D}^*)^{-1}$$

an extremal situation can be met in Theorem 8.2. Namely, there exist functions $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{D})$ satisfying the equation $U = \underline{I_2} \cdot \underline{I_1}^{-1}$.

Acknowledgment

The authors are grateful to Professor V.E. Katsnelson, who carefully read an older version of this manuscript. His comments and remarks very much influenced and improved the conception and presentation of the content of this paper.

References

- [1] D.Z. AROV: *Darlington realization of matrix-valued functions* (in Russian), Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Mat. 37 (1973), 1299–1331; English transl. in: Math USSR Izv. 7 (1973) 1295–1326.
- [2] D.Z. AROV: *Regular J -inner matrix functions and related continuation problems*, in: Linear Operators in Function Spaces (Eds.: G. Arsene, H. Helson, B. Sz.-Nagy, F.-H. Vasilescu), Oper. Theory. Adv. Appl., Vol. 43, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1990, pp. 65–87.
- [3] S.S. BOIKO, V.K. DUBOVOY, B. FRITZSCHE, B. KIRSTEIN: *Shift operators contained in contractions and pseudocontinuable matrix-valued Schur functions*, Math. Nachr. 278 (2005), 784–807.
- [4] M.S. BRODSKII: *Unitary operator colligations and their characteristic functions* (in Russian), Uspekhi Mat. Nauk 33 (1978), Issue 4, 141–168; English transl. in: Russian Math. Surveys 33 (1978), Issue 4, 159–191.
- [5] J.A. CIMA, W.T. ROSS: *The Backward shift on the Hardy Space*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, Vol. 79, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I. 2000.
- [6] R.G. DOUGLAS, H.S. SHAPIRO, A.L. SHIELDS: *Cyclic vectors and invariant subspaces for the backward shift*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 20 (1970), 37–76.
- [7] V.K. DUBOVOY: *Shift operators contained in contractions, Schur parameters and pseudocontinuable Schur functions*, in: Interpolation, Schur Functions and Moment Problems (Eds.: D. Alpay, I. Gohberg), Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., Vol. 165, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2006, pp. 175–250.
- [8] V.K. DUBOVOJ, B. FRITZSCHE, B. KIRSTEIN: *Matricial Version of the Classical Schur Problem*, Teubner-Texte zur Mathematik, Bd. 129, Teubner, Leipzig 1992.
- [9] P.L. DUREN: *Theory of H^p Spaces*, Academic Press, New York 1970.
- [10] J.B. GARNETT: *Bounded Analytic Functions*, Academic Press, New York 1981.
- [11] K. HOFFMAN: *Banach Spaces of Analytic Functions*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1962.

- [12] V.E. KATSNELSON: *Description of a class of functions which admit an approximation by rational functions with preassigned poles I*, in: Matrix and Operator Valued Functions - The Vladimir Petrovich Potapov Memorial Volume (Eds. I. Gohberg, L.A. Sakhnovich), Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., Vol. 72, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1994, pp. 87–132.
- [13] R. NEVANLINNA: *Eindeutige analytische Funktionen*, Springer, Berlin 1953.
- [14] E.M. NIKISHIN, V.N. SOROKIN: *Rational Approximation and Orthogonality* (in Russian), Nauka, Moskva 1988.
- [15] M. ROSENBLUM, J. ROVNYAK: *Topics in Hardy Classes and Univalent Functions*, Birkhäuser, Basel 1994.
- [16] W.T. ROSS, H.S. SHAPIRO: *Generalized Analytic Continuation*, University Lecture Series, Vol. 25, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I. 2002.
- [17] H.S. SHAPIRO: *Weighted polynomial approximation and boundary behavior of analytic functions* (in Russian), in: Contemporary Problems in Theory Anal. Functions (Internat. Conf., Erevan, 1965), Nauka, Moscow, 1966, pp. 326–335.
- [18] H.S. SHAPIRO: *Generalized analytic continuation*, in: Symposia on Theoretical Physics and Mathematics, Vol. 8 (Symposium, Madras, 1967), Plenum Press, New York, 1968, pp. 151–163.
- [19] B. SIMON: *Orthogonal Polynomials on the Unit Circle. Part 1. Classical Theory; Part 2. Spectral Theory*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, Vol. 54, Part 1+2, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I. 2005.
- [20] G.TS. TUMARKIN: *Approximation with respect to various metrics of functions defined on the circumference to sequences of rational functions with fixed poles* (in Russian), Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Mat. 30 (1966), 721–766; English transl. in: Amer. Math. Soc. Transl., Series 2, Volume 177, 1968, pp. 183–233.
- [21] G.TS. TUMARKIN: *Necessary and sufficient conditions for the possibility of approximating a function on a circumference by rational functions, expressed in terms directly connected with the distribution of poles of the approximating functions* (in Russian), Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Mat. 30 (1966), 969–980; English transl. in: Amer. Math. Soc. Transl., Series 2, Volume 177, 1968, pp. 235–248.
- [22] G.TS. TUMARKIN: *Description of a class of functions admitting an approximation by fractions with preassigned poles* (in Russian), Izv. Akad. Nauk Armjan. SSR, Ser. Mat. 1 (1966), Issue 2, 85–109.
- [23] N. WIENER, P.R. MASANI: *The prediction theory of multivariate stochastic processes I. The regularity condition*, Acta Math. 98 (1957), 111–150.
- [24] N. WIENER, P.R. MASANI: *The prediction theory of multivariate stochastic processes II. The linear predictor*, Acta Math. 99 (1958), 93–137.

Vladimir K. Dubovoy
 Department of Mathematics and Mechanics
 Kharkov State University
 Svobody Square 4
 UA-61077 Kharkov, Ukraine
 e-mail: DUBOVOY@online.kharkiv.com

Bernd Fritzsche, Bernd Kirstein
Fakultät für Mathematik und Informatik
Universität Leipzig
Postfach 10 09 20
D-04009 Leipzig, Germany
e-mail: `{fritzsche,kirstein}@math.uni-leipzig.de`

Andreas Lasarow
Departement Computerwetenschappen
K.U. Leuven
Celestijnenlaan 200A - postbus: 02402
B-3001 Heverlee (Leuven), Belgium
e-mail: `Andreas.Lasarow@cs.kuleuven.be`